

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

**It is noticed that in the Final Office Action mailed August 5, 2003 the examiner recited the claim limitations of the originally filed claims, not the currently pending claims, in rejecting the pending claims.**

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by MacInnis (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,480).

Applicant respectfully submits that MacInnis cannot anticipate the pending claims, since MacInnis does not teach all the limitations in a relation as recited in the pending independent claims.

The examiner stated that the variations of the CLUT (color look-up table) output were interpreted as corresponding to the term "behavior". Claim 1, for example, recites:

1. A method, comprising:  
retrieving a first command from a script written for a first color space;  
determining a behavior of the first command, wherein the behavior of  
the first command is:  
unique when the first command operates only in the first color  
space,  
transparent when the first command generates similar results in  
the first color space and in a second color space, and  
different when the first command generates different results in  
the first color space and in the second color space; and  
processing an operation associated with the first command in a  
preferred color space according to the behavior of the first  
command.

Thus, it is apparent that the examiner was considering the CLUT as corresponding to the term “the first command”. However, MacInnis does not disclose determining the behavior of the CLUT where the behavior is unique when the CLUT operates only in the first color space, transparent when the CLUT generates similar results in the first color space and in a second color space, and different when the CLUT generates different results in the first color space and in the second color space.

The examiner did not specifically point out what in MacInnis corresponds to the limitation of “determining a behavior of the first command”. The examiner pointed to Col. 7 lines 34-35, Col. 14 line 4-14 and Col. 7 lines 35-39 of MacInnis in references to unique behavior, transparent behavior and different behavior. However, col. 7, lines 34-35, of MacInnis discloses the use of only one CLUT in one embodiment of MacInnis; col. 14, line 4-14, of MacInnis discloses one alpha type (00b) that may be specified a part of a window descriptor; and, col. 7, lines 35-39, of MacInnis discloses the use of multiple CLUTs in an alternative embodiment of MacInnis. It is clear that the description of an alpha type that relates to whether a pixel is opaque or transparent has no relation with determining a behavior of the first command, wherein the behavior of the first command is transparent when the first command generates similar results in the first color space and in a second color space. There is no description in MacInnis that relates to the determination of whether a CLUT (which was considered as the first command by the examiner) generates similar results in a first color space and in a second color space so that the behavior of the CLUT may be determined to be transparent. Similarly, the description of using one or multiple CLUTs has no relation with determining the behavior of CLUT as unique (when the first command operates only in the first color space) or different (when the first command generates different results in the first color space and in the second color space). Thus, MacInnis has no description of “determining a behavior of the first command” in the manner recited in the claim.

Further, MacInnis has no description of "processing an operation associated with the first command in a preferred color space according to the behavior of the first command".

Col. 7, lines 14-25 and col. 9, lines 5-23 of MacInnis does not show processing an operation according to the determined behavior of the CLUT (which was considered as the first

command by the examiner). MacInnis does not show determining the behavior of the CLUT in a manner as recited in the claim; and, MacInnis cannot have a description of an operation that is processed according to the determined behavior.


Thus, MacInnis does not anticipate independent claims 10, 19 and 28 and dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27 and 29-36 at least for the above reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the teaching of MacInnis is substantially irrelevant to the pending claims and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on MacInnis is improper.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Furthermore, if an extension is required, applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/5, 2003



Lehua Wang  
Reg. No. 48,023

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300